



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,798	12/28/2000	Thomas E. Donaldson	06975-146001/ Search2	6269

26171 7590 02/21/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
1425 K STREET, N.W.  
11TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/749,798

Applicant(s)

DONALDSON ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4, 6, 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2171

## DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 1/23/2003.

### 1. *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed on January 13, 2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Because they have been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

### 2. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Regarding claims 4 and 14, the term "offensive" is indefinite because it is a subjective value judgment that differs from one person to next.

### 3. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-6, 9, 12 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (U.S 6385602) (Tso) in view of Russell-Falla et al. (U.S 6266664) (Russell).**

Regarding claims 1 and 16, Tso disclose: A method and a system for searching different data stores based on a classification of a search term (col. 4, lines 16-30, Tso), the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2171

receiving at least one search term (104, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying the search term among at least first and second categories (212, Fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso);

when the search term is classified within the first category (302, Fig. 3 and corresponding text, Tso), comparing the search term to first electronic information within a first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (col. 10, lines 22-36, Tso);

displaying a result based on the matches that are determined to exist (222, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso);

However, Tso didn't disclose: when the search term is classified within the second category, comparing the search term to at least second electronic information within at least a second electronic information store that differs from the first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist. On the other hand, Russell disclose: when the search term is classified within the second category comparing the search term to at least second electronic information within at least a second electronic information store that differs from the first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (col. 4, lines 61 to col. 5, lines 19, Russell). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step to compare the second electronic information store in the system of Tso as taught by Russell. The motivation being to query the difference kind of information store in the databases.

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein comparing the search term when the search

Art Unit: 2171

term is classified within the second category comprises comparing the search term to the first electronic information within the first electronic information store and to the second electronic information within the second electronic information store (col. 9, lines 55-66, Tso).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein: receiving at least one search term comprises receiving several search terms (204, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso) and grouping the search terms received as a single string (216, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying the search term comprises classifying the single string of search terms among at least first and second categories (212, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso);

comparing the search term when the single string of search terms is classified within the first category comprises comparing the single string of search terms to the first electronic information within the first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (col. 4, lines 16-19, Tso); and

comparing the search term when the single string of search terms is classified within the second category comprises comparing the single string of search terms to the second electronic information within the second electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (col. 6, lines 1-12, Tso).

Regarding claim 4, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein the first electronic information includes contents relating to non-offensive web sites (410, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Tso); the second

Art Unit: 2171

electronic information includes contents relating to offensive web sites (col. 2, lines 63 to col. 3, lines 8, Russell). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the offensive web sites in the system of Tso as taught by Russell. The motivation being to screen for offensive materials from web sites.

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein the method is performed by a web host having members (424, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Tso) and the method further comprises:

automatically scanning contents of a web site when the web site is accessed by members of the web host (col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 8, Tso);

classifying the contents of the web site among at least one of the first electronic information within the first electronic information store and the second electronic information within the second electronic information store(col. 9, lines 55-66, Tso);

storing the contents of the web site in the first electronic information within the first electronic information store when the contents of the web site are classified among the first electronic information (410, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Tso); and

storing the contents of the web site in the second electronic information within the second electronic information store when the contents of the web site are classified among the second electronic information (col. 4, lines 3 to col. 5, lines 19). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of storing the contents of the web site in the system of Tso as taught by Russell. The motivation being to

Art Unit: 2171

enable users to store the classified information in separate database for managing data in storages.

Regarding claims 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 5. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein the first electronic information store is located on a first server (430, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Tso) and the second electronic information store is located on a second server that differs from the first server (10, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Russell).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Tso/Russell disclose: A method and a computer program of storing searchable contents into more than one distinct data store (col. 4, lines 16-30, Tso), the method comprising: receiving content (104, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying the content among a first electronic information store and a second electronic information store (col. 5, lines 43-47, Tso); and

storing the content based on the classifying among the first electronic information store and the second electronic information store (col. 10, lines 50-58, Tso).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein the first electronic information store includes non-offensive content (col. 10, lines 49-52, Tso).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 17 and 20, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 16 and 19, respectively. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein the computer readable medium comprises a propagated signal (col. 11, lines 47-62, Tso).

Regarding claims 18 and 21, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 17 and 20, respectively. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein the propagated signal comprises a carrier wave (col. 11, lines 47-62, Tso).

Regarding claim 14, Tso/Russell disclose: A system for storing searchable content, comprising: a first electronic information store that includes content that has been classified as non-offensive(410, fig. 4, and corresponding text, Tso); and a second electronic information store that includes content that has been classified as offensive (col. 2, lines 63 to col. 3, lines 8, Russell). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the offensive web sites in the system of Tso as taught by Russell. The motivation being to screen for offensive materials from web sites.

Regarding claim 15, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 14. In addition, Tso/Russell disclose: wherein the first electronic information store is included on a first server and the second electronic information store is included on a second server that differs from the first server (col. 2, lines 66 to col. 3, lines 11, Belfiore).



**5. Claims 7, 8, 10, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (U.S 6385602) (Tso) in view of Belfiore et al. (U.S 6038610) (Belfiore).**

Regarding claim 7, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. However, Tso/Russell didn't disclose: wherein the first electronic information includes full text, titles, descriptions, and addresses of web sites such that the comparing the search term to the first electronic information within the first electronic information store comprises comparing the search term to the full text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of web sites to determine whether matches exist. On the other hand, Belfiore disclose: wherein the first electronic information includes full text, titles, descriptions, and addresses of web sites such that the comparing the search term to the first electronic information within the first electronic information store comprises comparing the search term to the full text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of web sites to determine whether matches exist (col. 4, lines 58 to col. 5, lines 23, Belfiore). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of comparing the search term to the full text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of web sites to determine whether matches exist in the combination system of Tso and Russell as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to enable users to choose the most relevant hits without the loss of information.

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Tso/Russell/Belfiore disclose: wherein the second electronic information includes full text, titles, descriptions, and addresses of web sites such that the comparing the search term to the second

Art Unit: 2171

electronic information within the second electronic information store comprise comparing the search term to the full text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of web sites to determine whether matches exist (col. 4, lines 58 to col. 5, lines 23, Belfiore).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9. In addition, Tso//Russell/ Belfiore disclose: wherein the classifying is based on content received from a listing service (col. 11, lines 41-59, Belfiore). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of received the classification from a listing service in the combination system of Tso and Russell as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to provide clues to users on whether or not they wish to access certain web pages.

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9. In addition, Tso/Russell/Belfiore disclose: wherein the classifying is based on the content itself (col. 12, lines 19-25, Belfiore). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the classifying is based on the content itself in the combination system of Tso /Russell as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to provide clues to users on whether or not they wish to access certain web pages.

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. In addition, Tso/Russell/Belfiore disclose: wherein the second electronic information store includes offensive content (col. 2, lines 59-65, Belfiore).

Art Unit: 2171

**6. Response to arguments**

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**7. Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

*cn*

Cindy Nguyen

February 12, 2003

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100